



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/025,911	12/26/2001	Dong Jae You	8733.543.00	7511
30827	7590	05/31/2006	EXAMINER	
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 1900 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006				DONG, DALEI
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2879		

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

H/P

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/025,911	YOU, DONG JAE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dalei Dong	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2006.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-6 and 18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-6 and 18 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 26 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</li> <li>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</li> <li>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</li> </ol>
---	--

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The Amendment filed on May 5, 2006, has been entered and acknowledged by the Examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,752,241 to Matsuoka of record in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,680,505 to Funada of record.

Regarding to claim 1, Matsuoka discloses in Figures 1-4, a lamp apparatus comprising: a lamp (2) comprising an electrode; a wire (3) to deliver the external voltage; and an L-shaped connector (5) for electrically connecting the electrode of the lamp (2) to the wire (3), the L-shaped connector (5) directly contacting the electrode of the lamp and a portion of the wire (3), wherein the L-shaped connector includes: a first cured wing (5a) for directly contacting the electrode of the lamp; and a second curve (5b) for directly contacting a portion of the wire (3).

However, Matsuoka does not disclose the lamp capable of using a discharge to generate light for the liquid crystal display.

The Examiner asserts that the discharge lamp used for liquid crystal display is old and well known in the art as taught by the Funada reference. The Funada reference teaches, in Figures 1-3, a lamp capable of using a discharge of an external voltage applied to an electrode (2) of the lamp to generate light for the liquid crystal display (see column 5, lines 17-20) for the purpose of improving the discharge lamp with high luminous efficiency.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilize the discharge lamp utilized for liquid crystal display of Funada for the lamp apparatus of Matsuoka in order to improve the discharge lamp with high luminous efficiency.

Regarding to claim 2, Matsuoka discloses in Figures 1-4, a unifying means (1) for integrally forming the power terminal of the lamp and the wire (3) electrically connected to each other via the connector (5).

Regarding to claim 4, Trautner discloses, the unifying means (1) is a molded product (see column 2, lines 14-19) for unifying an end of the lamp (2), the electrode of the lamp, the connector (5) and the wire (3).

Regarding to claim 18, the limitation of "injection-molded product is molded around the lamp and the wire" is a method of forming a device and is not germane to the

issue of patentability of the device itself. Therefore, this limitation has not been given patentable weight.

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,752,241 to Matsuoka of record in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,680,505 to Funada of record and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 2,988,725 to Vallee of record.

Regarding to claim 5, Matsuoka in view of Funada discloses, a lamp apparatus comprising: a lamp (2) capable of using a discharge of an external voltage applied to an electrode of the lamp to generate light for the liquid crystal display; a wire (3) to deliver the external voltage; and an L-shaped connector (5) for electrically connecting the electrode of the lamp (2) to the wire (3), the L-shaped connector (5) directly contacting the electrode of the lamp and a portion of the wire (3), wherein the L-shaped connector includes: a first cured wing (5a) for directly contacting the electrode of the lamp; and a second curve (5b) for directly contacting a portion of the wire (3).

However, Matsuoka and Funada does not disclose a material of the injection molded product is selected from any one of the group comprising plastic and silicon.

Vallee teaches in Figures 1 and 2, a lamp apparatus comprising: a material for molded product (8) is selected from any one of the group comprising plastic and silicon (see column 2, lines 57-63) for the purpose of simplifying and facilitating the manufacturing process.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilize the discharge lamp utilized for liquid crystal

display of Funada and the material of Vallee for the lamp apparatus of Matsuoka in order to improve the discharge lamp with high luminous efficiency and simplify and facilitate the manufacturing process.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,752,241 to Matsuoka of record in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,680,505 to Funada of record and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,035,655 to Hesse.

Regarding to claim 6, Matsuoka in view of Funada discloses, a lamp apparatus comprising: a lamp (2) capable of using a discharge of an external voltage applied to an electrode of the lamp to generate light for the liquid crystal display; a wire (3) to deliver the external voltage; and an L-shaped connector (5) for electrically connecting the electrode of the lamp (2) to the wire (3), the L-shaped connector (5) directly contacting the electrode of the lamp and a portion of the wire (3), wherein the L-shaped connector includes: a first cured wing (5a) for directly contacting the electrode of the lamp; and a second curve (5b) for directly contacting a portion of the wire (3), and wherein the first curved wing (5a) is at least partially surrounding the electrode of the lamp.

However, Matsuoka and Funada does not disclose the second curved wing is at least partially surrounding the portion of the wire.

Hesse teaches in Figures 1-4, a lamp apparatus comprising: the second curved wing (30) is at least partially surrounding the portion of the wire (12 and 13) for the purpose of improving the receptacle assembly.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have utilize the discharge lamp utilized for liquid crystal display of Funada and the second curve portion of Hesse for the lamp apparatus of Matsuoka in order to improve the discharge lamp with high luminous efficiency and improve the receptacle assembly.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed May 5, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to Applicant's argument that the Matsuoka reference and the Funada reference taken alone or in combination fails to teach or suggest a second curved wing for directly contacting a portion of the wire, the Examiner respectfully disagree. The Examiner asserts that the Matsuoka reference clearly discloses in Figures 1-4, that the second curved wing (5b) is directly contacting a portion of the wire (3) (see column 2, lines 39-47). Thus, the Examiner asserts that the prior art of record teaches the claimed invention and maintains the rejection.

Also, in response to Applicant's argument that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the connector-side terminal 5b of the Matsuoka reference is curved and a wing, the Examiner respectfully disagree. In the Specification Applicant discloses the second curved wing is curved relative to the first portion and not itself curved. Therefore, the Examiner interprets that the second curved portion to be the connector-

Art Unit: 2879

side terminal 5b of the Matsuoka reference. Thus, the Examiner asserts that the prior art of record teaches the claimed invention and maintains the rejection.

*Conclusion*

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dalei Dong whose telephone number is (571)272-2370. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 A.M. to 5 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar Patel can be reached on (571)272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



D.D.  
May 24, 2006

*K.Guharay* 5/26/06  
Karabi Guharay  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2879